



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,860	02/19/2004	Gadze C. Nauta	0142-0446P	1969
2292 7590 10/29/2008 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER SINGH, SATWANT K				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/29/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/780,860

Applicant(s)

NAUTA, GADZE C.

Examiner

SATWANT K. SINGH

Art Unit

2625

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 02 July 2008.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7, and 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuchitoi et al. (US 7,145,683) in view of Gassho et al. (US 7,180,626) and Lin (US 7,145,673).
5. Regarding Claim 1, Tuchitoi et al teaches a system for processing print jobs in a network a client station adapted to submit print jobs, and at least one printing device containing a control unit and a printer (Fig. 1, printer 150), the control unit including storage means for storing print jobs submitted to the printing device (Fig. 1, information manager 160 stores a print job or device information in the database) (col. 8, line 64 - col. 9, line 5), which comprises means for generating and submitting a print account job containing account information of a print job (database manages various types of information, such as information concerning the printer or the attributes of a print job) (col. 8, lines 44-48), wherein the print account job is linked to the corresponding print job

by a linking identifier (job attribute ID) (col. 10, lines 42-57), and means for validating stored print jobs for printing (user ID and a password) (col. 10, lines 33-37), wherein said validating means receives account jobs and validates a corresponding print job for printing in the case a valid account job has been received (user ID and password are used for the authentication of a packet transmitted) (col. 10, lines 33-37).

Tuchitoi et al fails to teach a system wherein the network contains a plurality of client stations.

Gassho et al fails teaches a system wherein the network contains a plurality of client stations (Fig. 1, client PCs 20, 30, and 40) (col. 9, lines 24-36).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Tuchitoi with the teaching of Gassho to allow a plurality of users to submit print jobs over the network and allow the system to track the printer consumable usage of the different users.

Tuchitoi et al and Gassho et al fail to teach a system wherein the print account job is generated as a second print job.

Lin teaches a system wherein the print job is generated as a second print job (remote manager receives data output form a database, transforms the data in some desired way and then outputs the transformed data stream to the printer driver) (col. 3, lines 18-22).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Tuchitoi and Gassho with the teaching of Lin to allow a user to output the printer consumable history so user's can

have a hardcopy version of the usage history to be used in reports or just to have for future reference.

6. Regarding Claim 2, Tuchitoi et al teaches a system, wherein the client station comprises a job submitter including said means for generating and submitting print account jobs (Fig. 1, job packet generator 107) (col. 9, lines 51-57).

7. Regarding Claim 3, Tuchitoi et al teaches a system, wherein a server station is adapted to intercept a submitted print job, said server station comprising means for generating and submitting a print account job containing account information of the intercepted print job, wherein the print account job is linked to the corresponding print job by a linking identifier (job attribute ID) col. 10, lines 42-57).

8. Regarding Claim 4, Tuchitoi et al teaches a system, wherein the server station is adapted to communicate with a client station to obtain account information of the intercepted print job for insertion in the print account job (job attribute ID) (col. 10, lines 42-57).

9. Regarding Claim 5, Tuchitoi et al fails to teach a system, wherein a printer server comprises said means for validating stored print jobs for printing and wherein said validating means validates a print job by generating a print validation command for a corresponding print job and submitting the print validation command to the printing device.

Gassho et al teaches a system, wherein a printer server comprises said means for validating stored print jobs for printing and wherein said validating means validates a print job by generating a print validation command for a corresponding print job and

submitting the print validation command to the printing device (print server separate from the printer) (col. 25, lines 11-18).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Tuchitoi with the teaching of Gassho to have the print server validate the print jobs so all of job accounting information is stored at one central location.

10. Regarding Claim 6, Tuchitoi et al teaches a system, wherein the control unit of the printing device is adapted to receive print jobs, and print account jobs (controller synchronizes the individual sections so as to correctly perform a plurality of print jobs) (col. 8, lines 54-60), and wherein said validating means are part of the control unit of the printing device (user ID and password are used for the authentication of a packet transmitted) (col. 10, lines 33-37).

11. Regarding Claim 7, Tuchitoi et al teaches a system, wherein the control unit of the printing device (job pre-processor employs operation code stored in the header of the job packet) (col. 8, line 61 – col. 9, line 5) stores all submitted print and account jobs in a holding queue in the storage means (information manager stores a print job) (col. 8, line 61 – col. 9, line 5), said: control unit being arranged to check stored print and account jobs in order to match linked print and account jobs (authentication of a packet) (col. 10, lines 33-37), so that in the case where a print job is matched with an account job the account information is checked, and if the account information is valid, the print job is removed from the holding queue and validated for printing (drawing object is temporarily stored in the drawing unit until the actual printing is initiated) (col. 9, lines

17-25) and the account job is removed from the holding queue and the account information is stored in the storage means (job attribute setup operation) (col. 10, lines 42-57).

12. Regarding Claim 10, Tuchitoi et al teaches a the client station being adapted to submit print jobs, wherein a job submitter is provided, including means for generating and submitting a print account job containing account information of a print job (Fig. 1, job packet generator 107) (col. 9, lines 51-57)., the print account job being linked to the corresponding print job by a linking identifier (job attribute ID) (col. 10, lines 42-57).

13. Regarding Claim 11, Tuchitoi et al teaches a server station, wherein the server station is adapted to intercept a submitted print job, the server station comprising means for generating and submitting a print account job containing account information of the intercepted print job, wherein the print account job is linked to the corresponding print job by a linking identifier (job attribute ID) col. 10, lines 42-57).

14. Regarding Claim 12, Tuchitoi et al teaches a server station, which is adapted to communicate with a client station to obtain account information of the intercepted print job for insertion in the print account job (job attribute ID) (col. 10, lines 42-57).

15. Regarding Claim 13, Tuchitoi et al fails to teach a printer server, including means for validating stored print jobs for printing and wherein said validating means validates a print job by generating a print validation command for a corresponding print job and submitting the print validation command to the printing device.

Gassho et al teaches a print server, including means for validating stored print jobs for printing and wherein said validating means validates a print job by generating a

print validation command for a corresponding print job and submitting the print validation command to the printing device (print server separate from the printer) (col. 25, lines 11-18).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Tuchittoi with the teaching of Gassho to have the print server validate the print jobs so all of job accounting information is stored at one central location.

16. Claim 14 is rejected for the same reason as claim 10.
17. Claim 15 is rejected for the same reason as claim 1.
18. Claim 16 is rejected for the same reason as claim 11.
19. Claim 17 is rejected for the same reason as claim 13.
20. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuchittoi et al. (US 7,145,683) in view of Lin (US 7,145,673).
21. Regarding Claim 8, Tuchittoi et al teaches a printing device (Fig. 1, printer 150),, comprising a control unit and a printer, the control unit including storage means for storing print jobs in a holding queue the control unit of the printing device being adapted to receive print jobs (Fig. 1, information manager 160 stores a print job or device information in the database) (col. 8, line 64 - col. 9, line 5), wherein the control unit controlling means for validating stored printing jobs for printing (user ID and a password) (col. 10, lines 33-37), said validating means being adapted to receive account jobs and validate a corresponding print job for printing in case a valid account job has been received (job attribute ID) (col. 10, lines 42-57).

Tuchitoy et al fails to teach a system wherein the print account job is generated as a second print job.

Lin teaches a system wherein the print job is generated as a second print job (remote manager receives data output form a database, transforms the data in some desired way and then outputs the transformed data stream to the printer driver) (col. 3, lines 18-22).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Tuchitoy with the teaching of Lin to allow a user to output the printer consumable history so user's can have a hardcopy version of the usage history to be used in reports or just to have for future reference.

22. Regarding Claim 9, Tuchitoy et al teaches a printing device, wherein the control unit (job pre-processor employs operation code stored in the header of the job packet) (col. 8, line 61 – col. 9, line 5) stores all submitted print and account jobs in a holding queue in the storage means (information manger stores a print job) (col. 8, line 61 – col. 9, line 5), said: control unit being arranged to check stored print and account jobs in order to match linked print and account jobs (authentication of a packet) (col. 10, lines 33-37), so that in the case where a print job is matched with an account job the account information is checked, and if the account information is valid, the print job is removed from the holding queue and validated for printing (drawing object is temporarily stored in the drawing unit until the actual printing is initiated) (col. 9, lines 17-25) and the account job is removed from the holding queue and the account information is stored in the storage means (job attribute setup operation) (col. 10, lines 42-57).

Conclusion

23. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SATWANT K. SINGH whose telephone number is (571)272-7468. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles can be reached on (571) 272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Edward L. Coles/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Satwant K. Singh/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

sks